

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-15 are present for examination.

Claim Objection:

The examiner has objected to claim 7 as indicated in paragraph 2 of the outstanding office action. Claim 7 has been canceled.

Section 101 Rejection:

Claims 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 14 and 15 to recited a “computer readable storage medium” and delete the recitation of the “program storage medium.” As such, these claims are believed to be drawn to statutory subject matter within the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101. It is thus submitted that the § 101 rejection should be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejection:

Claims 1, 4, 7-8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by applicant’s admitted prior art (APA). Further dependent claims 2, 5, 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Fushimoto (5,742,505). Finally, claims 3, 6, 10, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Murata (5,987,402). Apparently, the examiner intended to make the Sec. 103 rejections as rejections based on the primary teaching of applicant’s APA in combination with the secondary teachings of Fushimoto and Murata, and Applicant will treat the rejections as such.

The Examiner’s rejections are respectfully traversed.

The primary teaching of applicant’s APA at least does not disclose the limitations of the retranslation instruction part which permits a display of a “rettranslation instruction input part” on the terminal of a user. As explained in the application on the paragraph bridging

pages 3 and 4, the prior art required the user to re-input each time the object document location information (as well as the source/destination languages). Thus, if the user was not sure of the original language of the document to be translated, the user would need to specify several source languages. In the prior art, with each source language indicated, the document location information need to be again supplied by the user. Additionally, in the case an original document needed to be translated into several target languages, the user likewise was required to input the source documents location information each time. As yet another example, if the original document contained say 10 pages of in a first language and the next 12 pages in a second language, the user needed upon encountering page 11 would have to go back to the input page to again input all of the parameters needed to specify the location of the source document (which is the most likely source of error) as well as the new source language itself.

In accordance, with applicant's recited limitations, the retranslation instruction input part is used to generate on the user display screen a retranslation instruction input part which automatically sends a second translation instruction to the translation server. This second translation instruction includes the source language information and the target language information in the language information input column **and the location information, previously inputted by a user of the terminal, representing the location of the object document to be translated.** Further, as recited in the independent claims, **the location information was previously inputted by the user of the terminal in the first translation instruction.** Thus, the user need only specify the location information in the **first** translation instruction and **not in the retranslation or "second" instruction.** The "retranslation instruction icon" displayed on the user display is shown, for example at 116 in applicant's Fig. 12. Note that the document location information is already specified on this displayed screen and the user need not re-enter this information as was done in the first translation instruction. In this connection note the claim language of claim 1 for example reciting that the terminal displays:

- (1) at least one language information input column for inputting the source language information and the target

language information by the user (2) **the location information, previously inputted by a user of the terminal**, representing the location of the object document to be translated and (3) a retranslation instruction input part; and, upon operation of the retranslation instruction input part by the user of the terminal,

Thus, as explained above, the APA does not disclose significant recited limitations of applicant's claims. Applicant's claims have been amended to make the above discussed limitations and distinctions more clear.

As stated by the Federal Circuit: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, (Fed. Cir. 1989). See MPEP §2131. In order for a reference to be utilized as an anticipatory reference under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every claim limitation. This is certainly not the case here, and thus the Sec. 102 rejection as to the independent claims must be withdrawn.

The secondary references fail to teach the missing ingredients as discussed above which are not shown in APA.

Fushimoto, cited by the examiner against claims 2, 5, 9 and 12, does not disclose the feature claimed in the present application in which the language input column includes an source language information list box for selecting one of a plurality of source language information and a **separate** target language information list box ...". The Fushimoto reference discloses a list that merely combines in a fixed, predetermined manner, an original language and a target language. The Fushimoto reference loses the freedom of combinations of languages and does not allow selection of only either the original or the target language as does applicant's invention as recited in the rejected dependent claims 2, 5, 9 and 12.

It is pointed out that the general meaning of a list box is found at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_box;

A list box is a GUI widget that allows the user to select one or more items from a list contained within a static, multiple line text box. The user clicks inside the box on an item to select it, holding the Shift or Control (Command for Mac users) key allowing him or her to make multiple selections.

Further, the Fushimoto reference does not disclose setting the source language information and the target language information to initial values and especially does not disclose setting these source language and target language information to initial values as specified by the previously inputted information in the first translation instruction.

Furthermore, a translation server is connected to a terminal device through a network and a list box given at this server is displayed on the terminal device. The Fushimoto reference does not disclose the system comprising the server and the terminal.

The Murata reference was cited by the examiner in connection with claims 3, , 10 and 15. While Murata does discuss linked documents and the ability to obtain and translate such documents, Murata does not disclose the re-translation instruction part as recited in applicant's independent claims and thus not cure the basic deficiency missing from applicant's APA as far as the Sec. 103 rejection is concerned. The "TRANSLATION" buttons which appear in Murata's Figs. 7 and 9 refer to a "first" translation and do not provide a means to initiate a second translation into, for example, a different language selected by the user. As such, the combined teachings of APA and Murate do not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. I

It is thus submitted that the PTO has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103, and thus applicants dependent claims are likewise patentable over the prior art.

Conclusions:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6-14-06

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257